

VZCZCXYZ0001
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0181/01 0751317
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 161317Z MAR 09
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2672
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDOG/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000181

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS AND DENYER)
NSC FOR FLY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CWC: WRAP-UP FOR MARCH 9-13, 2009

REF: A. THE HAGUE 167
[1](#)B. STATE 23254

This is CWC-16-09.

SUMMARY

[1](#)1. (SBU) The Western European and Others Group (WEOG) met March 10 to prepare for a meeting of the WEOG representatives to the Executive Council (EC) requested by the Chair to discuss the selection process for a new Director-General (DG). Only two formal candidatures have been announced, Algerian Ambassador Benchaa Dani, and Turkish Permanent Representative to the UN in Geneva, Ambassador Ahmet Uzumcu, but Germany, UK and Switzerland all expect to field candidates shortly.

[1](#)2. (SBU) Delreps also met with Technical Secretariat (TS) representatives on March 11 to discuss the Libyan former CW production facility at Rabta, and called on the new head of the Policy Review Branch, Stian Holen, on March 12.

[1](#)3. (SBU) Iraq submitted its initial declaration on March 12. The Iraqi Ambassador was not available, but Delreps will meet with him the week of March 16 to present the non-paper on preparations for the EC (56) in April (Ref B).

WEOG

[1](#)4. (SBU) German Ambassador Werner Burkart chaired the weekly WEOG meeting on March 10. The meeting was kept short and focused on the selection process for the next Director-General in advance of a meeting the EC Chairperson had called for WEOG members of the Council. Noting that there will be multiple candidates put forward by WEOG countries, Burkart said that the Group will have to discuss how to handle coordination. Turkish Ambassador Selahattin Alpar spoke briefly about Turkey's DG

candidate, Ahmet Uzumcu (currently the Turkish Permanent Representative to the UN in Geneva) and announced that Uzumcu plans to visit The Hague and would like to meet with WEOG delegations.

15. (SBU) Burkart reported that Tomova had drafted and signed the letter inviting nominations for DG from all member states and that it would be circulated shortly by the Technical Secretariat to all delegations. (Del Note: Del received the letter on March 13 and forwarded to Washington. End Note.) Burkart also stated that Tomova's intention is to meet with the EC members from each regional group to discuss procedures for the selection process. He suggested that it would be wiser to focus on the immediate future rather than trying to plan for every eventuality through the end of the year. Most delegations agreed with keeping the process clean and simple and focusing on a step-by-step approach. Swedish delegate Christer Ahlstrom said that it would be imperative for the October session of the EC (EC-58) to forward only one candidate to the Conference of the States Parties (CSP). Burkart added that taking the decision by consensus would be preferable, if possible.

16. (SBU) Ambassador Pieter de Savornin Lohman (Netherlands) warned against discussing process and procedure in an open-ended working group, as Iran had called for during the February EC (EC-55). He noted that in addition to the already-announced Algerian and Turkish candidates, there would likely be at least five more candidates, four of which might come from other WEOG countries. UK delegate Karen Wolstenholme informed those present that the UK Government had decided the previous day to nominate current Deputy Director-General (DDG) John Freeman for DG, but she asked that that information not be shared outside of WEOG. Swiss delegate Martin Strub also noted that Switzerland will likely put forward a candidate. Burkart announced that Germany will also nominate a candidate, pending approval by the Council of Ministers.

17. (SBU) Wolstenholme stated that the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) will want to avoid reaching consensus on a candidate during EC-58 in order to string things out and force a vote at the CSP where the NAM will have a majority. Irish delegate Michael Hurley stressed the need to make clear that the process is not up for negotiation and that deadlines (e.g., July 7 for nominations of candidates) are firm. Burkart noted that NAM delegations already are mentioning informally the possibility of considering candidates nominated after the July 7 deadline.

DG SELECTION: EC CHAIR MEETS WITH WEOG EC MEMBERS

18. (SBU) EC Chairperson Ambassador Oksana Tomova hosted the ten WEOG members of the Council at the Slovakian Embassy on March 10. She informed the group she planned to meet with each of the regional groups separately and then with the group coordinators, in accordance with the EC's directive for her to conduct consultations. She said the letter to all member states inviting candidates was with the Technical Secretariat but she planned to sign it later that day. She noted that the July 7 deadline is firm, although some delegations were speculating about later candidacies; there were also rumors of two deputies, but that was not the decision at hand for the Council. Burkart noted that the Preparatory Commission had discussed having two deputies, and the current corridor

discussions seemed to have picked that up. As agreed in the larger WEOG meeting (above), WEOG representatives urged a clean procedure, emphasizing that the Chair be in charge, and working toward consensus at the October EC. UK Ambassador Lyn Parker noted the gentlemen's agreement at the PrepCom, and that delegations may want private reassurances from candidates about a geographic balance for the Deputy Director-General, but that there should be no public linkages.

¶9. (SBU) Tomova noted that the Turkish government had asked that the curriculum vitae for its candidate be distributed, and that Algeria had sent a note verbale to all member states. The TS was circulating both as documents of the Council (EC-57), setting the model for later nominations. Parker and Burkart announced that there would be candidates from the UK and Germany, but did not divulge names. French delegate Mari proposed an anonymous vote in the EC if consensus proved difficult. Parker advised that, while a vote is always possible, it would be best not to discuss voting too early in the process. Some delegations, Qvoting too early in the process. Some delegations, he noted, would prefer that the decision go to the Conference, where the numbers for voting would be very different.

¶10. (SBU) Parker asked what would happen at EC-56 in April. Tomova said she would like to provide a document to the member states outlining the process. U.S. Delrep stated that a document could prove problematic and turn into a drafting exercise; she suggested that the Chairperson give an oral status report on her series of consultations and remind everyone of the calendar (July 7, presentations at EC-57, etc.). There was general agreement among the group that any explicit statement on criteria or vetting procedures be avoided. Several delegations spoke to the need for the Chair to have a free hand, and for a smooth transition from Tomova to Mexican Ambassador Lomonaco in May. Tomova welcomed the views of the WEOG reps and asked that she be invited to a WEOG-plus like-minded states' meeting in the weeks before the EC to discuss views with that larger group.

MEETING WITH TS TO DISCUSS LIBYAN CWPf CONVERSION

¶11. (SBU) On March 11, Delreps met with UK delegate Karen Wolstenholme and the following representatives from the Technical Secretariat (TS): Director of Verification Horst Reeps, Legal Advisor Santiago Onate, Chemical Demilitarization Branch (CDB) Head Dominique Anelli, and CDB Officer Oleg Ukharov. Delreps sought TS views on Libya's request to retain the protective berm and sandbag wall around its former production facility at Rabta. Onate agreed that moving a structure/feature from the "specialized" to "standard" list is an unprecedented change in a conversion plan, but also noted the TS view that the sandbag wall should never have been declared as specialized in the first place. Anelli and Ukharov confirmed that the TS now plans to capture the justification for retaining the sandbag wall in the change document it will issue to the Executive Council (EC). Delreps noted that this technical assessment from the Secretariat would facilitate Council members' consideration of the issue. Anelli recommended that Libya include details on this change and the justification in its 90-Day report to the Council.

¶12. (SBU) Action Request: Del requests guidance as to whether the U.S. is now in a position to support this change.

SUBMISSION OF IRAQ'S DECLARATION

¶13. (SBU) On March 12, Delrep confirmed with Iraqi Rep Abbas Fadhil Al-Kafhaji that Iraq had submitted its declaration (in English) to the TS. Delrep informed Abbas that the U.S. has a non-paper to provide to Iraqi Ambassador Banaa, and raised the possibility of experts from Baghdad participating in a working session April 16-17 (prior to EC-56) to develop Iraq's presentation to the EC-56 Destruction Informals. Abbas responded that his delegation is encouraging Baghdad to send expert representatives to EC-56, and he agreed to schedule a meeting for Delreps with the Ambassador next week.

DISCUSSIONS WITH NEW POLICY REVIEW BRANCH HEAD

¶14. (SBU) On March 12, Delreps met with Stian Holen, the new head of the OPCW's Policy Review Branch (PRB). Delreps found Holen to be engaged, enthusiastic, and interested in developing the policy role of the branch to include more effective analysis of inspections and exploring a longer-term vision for the Organization.

¶15. (SBU) Holen noted his view that, in comparison with other international organizations, the Executive Council of the OPCW seems remarkably complacent about deferring a significant number of agenda items for one or more sessions. Holen has also been surprised by the impact of the OPCW confidentiality regime on the Technical Secretariat's ability to synthesize and analyze inspection data. As an example, he explained that two inspectors may run across very similar issues on industry inspections in two different States Parties, but would never know this because they are not permitted to share the details of their inspections. One of Holen's goals for the coming year is to find, within the constraints of the confidentiality regime, a more effective way for inspectors to learn from each others' experience and for PRB to analyze trends. Holen also frankly noted the Director-General's cautious approach holds the TS back from proposing new initiatives.

¶16. (SBU) Holen informed Delreps that preparation of the 2008 Verification Implementation Report is proceeding on schedule and that he intends to continue improving the format and accessibility of information. He sought Del views on the TS's readiness to conduct a challenge inspection, and shared his own: that the headquarters element seems to be well trained, but that he has doubts about the ability of an inspection team on the ground to perform the tasks associated with a challenge inspection to a high standard. (Del Comment: This is consistent with U.S. and other informal reporting that the overall quality of inspections is decreasing. End Comment.) Holen hopes to involve the TS in a field exercise some time in the next two years, but this may be shaped by TS participation in the upcoming Investigation of Alleged Use exercise in Tunisia in 2010. Holen also noted the TS plans to hold a table-top exercise during 2009, having not had one since ¶2007.

¶17. (SBU) On staffing, Holen said that the OPCW has offered a position in PRB to Daniel Feakes, who will start at the end of May. He asked for U.S. views on the impact of the tenure policy, and noted that he believes the impact is exacerbated by budget and training issues. Referring to his experience at the UN's World Food Program, Holen remarked that the OPCW seems to be "run on a shoestring," which means that robust training that could be used to offset the effects of experienced personnel departing is often unaffordable.

¶18. (SBU) Holen sought U.S. views on current priorities and the future of the OPCW. Delreps highlighted the U.S. desire to see the Organization stay relevant in the evolving security environment, particularly where the industry inspection regime was concerned. Delreps also noted that it will be very important for the OPCW to become more effective in its non-proliferation role as chemical weapons destruction activity decreases. Holen said that he had also been surprised that more of PRB's time is not devoted to thinking about issues like this, particularly with 2012 approaching. He reiterated his intention to focus PRB away from more operational activities better suited to other Qmore operational activities better suited to other branches and toward policy formulation, including more medium- and long-term planning. To that end, Holen mentioned that one of PRB's new projects has been a paper on addressing the diminishing number of Schedule 3 industrial facilities that have not yet been inspected.

¶19. (U) Beik sends.
GALLAGHER